DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 062 587 AC 012 524

TITLE	The Waterfront is for Living and Learning.
INSTITUTION	Community Planning Association of Canada.; Ontario Inst. for Studies in Education, Toronto. Dept. of Adult Education.
NOTE	53p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	Adult Education; Attitudes; Change Agents; *Citizen Participation; *Learning Activities; Objectives; *Pilot Projects; *Urban Areas; *Workshops
IDENTIFIERS	Canada; Toronto; *Waterfront

ABSTRACT

A workshop concerned with citizen participation in the affairs of a city is discussed. The workshop, held on the waterfront in Toronto, was a pilot project. An underlying objective of the workshop was to lead its participants to a more personal and informed attitude toward life in a large urban community. This document is divided into two parts: Setting the Stage and The Discussion. Five appendixes present the following: A. Program, B. Participants, C. "Introduction to Waterfront Slide Show" by R. John Bower, D. What Is the Community Planning Association of Canada?, and E. Discussion Highlights. (CK)

AC0125[redacted]
24

ED 062587

ED 062587

THE WATERFRONT IS FOR
LIVING AND LEARNING

A workshop sponsored by
The Department of Adult Education,
The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education,
and The Toronto Region Branch,
Community Planning Association of Canada.

The symbol used on the front cover of this Report,
courtesy of the Metropolitan Toronto Planning Board.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The Steering Committee of the Workshop wish to thank those who took part in this experiment.

They would like to express particular thanks to the group leaders, the special speakers, and the student graduate assistants who as recorders, contributed so generously of their time and ability.

Grateful acknowledgments also to the Chairman and the staff of the Metropolitan Toronto Planning Board for their slide presentation of the Waterfront Plan and for their welcome presence as resource personnel throughout the day. To the Toronto Harbour Commissioners for the briefing session and boat ride that first awakened interest in the Waterfront at OISE, and for the contribution made by the Toronto Harbour Commissioners' staff in the group discussions.

Group Leaders:
Mrs. D.M. Eisen
Mr. Macklin Hancock
Dr. Ross Lord
Dr. Alex Murray
Dr. R.F. Stackhouse

Recorders:
Mrs. Margaret Bizzell
Miss Joanne Kidd
Mrs. Ann McKenzie
Mrs. Elizabeth Smith
Mr. Mike Waterhouse
Miss June Yew

The Steering Committee:
Dr. James A. Draper
Mr. Clifford McIntosh
Mrs. Joyce M. Tyrrell

FOREWORD

Why OISE-CPAC held a waterfront workshop

We were concerned with citizen participation in the affairs of their city.

We chose Metropolitan Toronto because that is where we are and where we found the greatest challenge.

We suspected that Metro is too big, too complicated to be comprehended whole, so for a beginning we selected one part, one viewpoint: the Metropolitan Toronto Waterfront and its recently proposed conceptual plan.

We saw the opportunities open to CPAC to promote citizen involvement in the actual use of the waterfront, and thus to encourage further good planning and sound implementation.

We saw the opportunity through the Department of Adult Education of OISE to alert educationists to the opportunities for learning that the Waterfront Plan provides.

We hoped that the living and learning experienced in relation to the Toronto Waterfront would in time lead the people of Metro to a more personal and more informed attitude to their entire life in a large urban community.

And so we made a beginning: we held our first Waterfront Workshop.

The first step on a long road

The OISE-CPAC first Waterfront Workshop was a pilot project. Its discussions were first steps on a long road. They were not designed to reach set conclusions or even to present a program, but to find out where among two specific groups--post-secondary institutions of learning and government departments--there might be the imagination and the will to pursue the objectives further. Insofar as limitations of space and budget permitted, we also invited representatives of other sections of the community.

Based on the results of the discussions at the workshop and more particularly on the feed-back which has reached us since, we now find that we have the impetus to approach other groups such as the schools, the communications media, voluntary associations, churches and libraries, business, industry, and labor.

We shall, of course, continue to be confronted with the questions that faced the OISE-CPAC steering committee from the beginning: "What is so special about the Metro Waterfront?" and "What has the Metro Waterfront to do with an educational institution such as OISE?" The answer is threefold.

First we believe that the involvement of citizens in their community, when that community is Metro Toronto with its population of two million, may need a special approach. It may be that citizens find Metro too big to swallow whole as an object of loyalty or love but by biting off one aspect of common interest, for example, the waterfront, with which they can identify, they will then gain an understanding of all of Metro and urban life.

Second, the waterfront is there, visible. It cuts across all political boundaries. It invokes the almost mystic magnetism that the sight, sound, and feel of water has for most of us. It affects rich and poor alike, and involves the whole spectrum of the population from the child on the beach to the giants of the Seaway. A waterfront plan for Metro is not a scheme for "do-gooders" but for citizens who are capable of looking at both the economy and the amenities of their community, and then establishing their priorities. It is a scheme in which the potential contribution of free enterprise is also fully recognized.

The third answer is strictly utilitarian and pragmatic. A concept for the waterfront in the form of a map and text is ready. It is definite enough for study, but not so definite that it cannot be changed. The brochure may be had free from the Metro Planning Board and slides are available on request. But perhaps best of all, the planning proposals involve many acres of "man made" land, land that is, not in private but in public ownership, land over which the public may have a share in the decision-making.

That will lead where?

And what of the future? The immediate program is one of infiltration—the infiltration of the waterfront idea into the normal activities of many institutions, clubs, and associations. Then, through these groups, we hope will come promotion—the greater use and enjoyment of the waterfront by the public, and greater knowledge of its potential through educational institutions. As one group member remarked: "At present nobody feels threatened by the loss of the waterfront because nobody feels they own it." Enjoyment is the first step toward such a feeling of public ownership. And when the groundswell of public identification with the waterfront has begun to rise, the function of the educationists will be to feed in the knowledge and the understanding of the issues. Then will be the moment for a structured program, for "Town Talk," for the blitz, for the big guns of the communications media, for sharp confrontations. Then too, our elected representatives will begin to be able to take the pulse of an informed public opinion and no longer will need to grope in a vacuum of apathy. The timing? A year? Two years? Who can say?

The credo of the adult education movement is based on the belief that quite ordinary men and women have within themselves and their communities the spiritual and intellectual resources adequate to the solution of their own problems. Quite ordinary men cannot pilot a space ship to the moon, but collectively it is they who decide whether or not it is to go. They cannot plan a waterfront, but they can and must decide the quality of the life of their city, and the part that such a waterfront is to play.

CONTENTS

Acknowledgments ii

Foreword iii

Welcome to the OISE-CPAC Workshop/K.F. Prueter 1

Why Are We Here?/James A. Draper 3

SETTING THE STAGE

The Waterfront and Metro's Future/W. Grant Messer 5

Today's Children and Tomorrow's Waterfront/Barry G. Lowes 7

Citizens and Their Waterfront/Donald Middleton 8

The Metropolitan Toronto Waterfront Plan: An Adventure in Learning?/ D. McCormack Smyth 10

THE DISCUSSION

The Waterfront is for Living and Learning 18

Group Reports 20

And What of the Future? 32

APPENDIXES

A. Program 33

B. Participants 35

C. Introduction to Waterfront Slide Show/R. John Bower 39

D. What is the Community Planning Association of Canada? 43

E. Discussion Highlights 45

WELCOME TO THE OISE-CPAC WORKSHOP

K.H. Prueter
Coordinator of Development, OISE

I am pleased to have been invited to extend a welcome on behalf of the Director of OISE, Dr. R.W.B. Jackson, the Chairman of the Department of Adult Education, Dr. Roby Kidd, and the other eight departments of OISE, to the participants of this workshop.

My interest in this conference is two-fold:

(1) The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education exists as an independent college—as a graduate school of education, and as a research and development institute for the purpose of identifying, studying, and contributing to crucial issues in education for today and tomorrow.

(2) The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education by its very structure, recognizes that many skills from many related disciplines must be coordinated and brought into focus upon these problems and issues.

This workshop exemplifies the purpose, as well as the approach of our entire Institute. The Waterfront Plan is but one of the current concepts which seeks development; planned to provide a better life for our citizens of today and tomorrow. It is recognized that is is difficult enough to plan adequately for today's needs. To be able to foresee, predict, and make provision for the conditions of the future is a complex and engaging task. We may well come closer to adequate answers through multi-disciplinary forums such as this.

What environmental and physical conditions are necessary for the good life? Must they be the same in an inner city, high density area as in a community of single family homes? Can we identify the conditions necessary for civilized living and then through intelligent planning for land use provide for these conditions for civilized living in ways which fit the type of community envisaged? For example, if we accept that good health is a necessary condition for good life, is it possible that the community planning for the waterfront development might make different provision for recreational acres and open spaces, than would be the case in a community in which boundaries and acreage are not so closely defined?

Matters such as these have already been considered and tentatively included in the waterfront planning. They may well receive your attention in your discussions today. Do we envisage the use of air space in the future in the way in which we planned for land use in the past?

Our greatest challenge relates to the difficulty of being able to plan adequately for the needs of the next five years and, at the same time, to make the physical manifestations of our planning flexible enough so that they can be adjusted to the needs of a future which we are unable to predict.

I was involved in educational planning in Metropolitan Toronto in the period 1951 to 1966. I need not remind you of the growth which took place in that period. Those of us so involved during that period did our work conscientiously and perhaps quite well. But with a little more care and competency could we have anticipated the changing patterns of land use; the development of high-rise residences; the increasing and changing traffic patterns; the increase in air travel and the consequent problem of noise factors? Or could we have predicted the changing patterns of teaching and learning? So many buildings we helped to design are incapable of expansion, are no longer in accord with the concepts of accessibility, safety, and environment which existed when we located them. Walls won't move and present form stands in the way of present function. Many of us wish we could now replan in the light of our experience.

In my office we have a large-scale study under way, known as the Educational Facilities Growth System which is really exploring, in cooperation with community planners and business, the feasibility of "the plug-in concept," units which can be added to and be subtracted from as changing conditions require. I would think that our study group might well be involved with the Metropolitan Planning group for the future development of the waterfront concept.

A concept is, in a sense a dream: and a good dream transcends the present. This group seeks to transcend the present into the future, for what we create for today must serve future generations. The very concept of education itself has changed and is continually changing. It now encompasses the entire span of life and provision for it is made in the total community as much as in the schoolhouse.

In looking at education within such an exciting development project as the waterfront you have accepted a very major task. Surely today's meeting must be only the first of many studies which must follow. Our Department of Adult Education and the Toronto Region Branch of the Community Planning Association of Canada are to be commended for their initiative in bringing us together for such an important purpose.

WHY ARE WE HERE?

James A. Draper
Department of Adult Education, OISE

The purpose for the workshop has more than words to it. There is also much feeling for the potential of the workshop itself, and feelings associated with the exciting concept for developing and revitalizing Metropolitan Toronto's waterfront. One of the major purposes of this workshop is to give consideration to these potentialities.

As step one, let me relate to you the purposes for the workshop as stated by the planning committee. They are:

1. To discuss the implications of the Plan for education and as resource material for educationists.
2. To explore the Plan's potential as a vehicle to educate citizens about the opportunities for urban living, and to examine the role of citizen participation in the planning process.
3. To become informed about the Plan, to understand its potential and the obstacles to its implementation.

All three of the above-stated purposes hold great implications for the total learning process apart from their relevance to more formalized educational factors.

As step two, let me see if I can convey my interpretation of the above three statements.

First: the waterfront concept holds potentials which go beyond the tangible outcomes of the Plan itself. Our involvement is likely to help us conceptually in developing other social development models. While implementing the one model, we are also exploring others.

Second: in attempting to implement the Plan there is great potential for citizen participation and citizen commitment. In one sense, the process of involvement in planning and decision-making and implementation has a distinct value in itself for it implies the self-growth of people.

Compared with many other plans, especially those which are limited to rehabilitation, to redevelopment, to renewal, this Plan offers opportunities to create not only material things but also the greater individual self-awareness which involvement and commitment can bring.

One of the purposes held for the workshop is that of exploring aspects of citizen involvement. If we are successful today, then it will be manifested through a continuing and ever-increasing involvement—not strictly with the specific Plan at hand but with the concept of social planning.

Underlying these purposes are a number of assumptions, three of which are: 1) that change does not have to be haphazard; 2) that man is capable of controlling aspects of his environment; 3) that to change aspects of our social, economic, and political system, relevant aspects of the environment must also be changed. Having stated the purposes for the workshop as indicated by the planning committee, and added to these some of my own interpretations—are these congruent with the purposes you have for being here?

There is a Chinese proverb which says:
If you are planning for one year—plant rice
If you are planning for ten years—plant fruit trees
If you are planning for one thousand years—plant men
Surely when we talk of the implementation of the Waterfront Plan we are not limited to only physical structures.

It can be said that one of the great outcomes of the waterfront development is the development of people, that is, if, as stated in the Chinese proverb, we are concerned about things beyond tomorrow.

THE WATERFRONT AND METRO'S FUTURE

W. Grant Messer
Chairman
Metropolitan Toronto Planning Board

I am honored to be a part of such a distinguished panel and gathering. The list of group leaders for this workshop is outstanding and it is personally a pleasure to see included the name of Dr. G. Ross Lord who was associated with the Waterfront Plan during its five years of growth.

In acting on behalf of the Chairman of the Metropolitan Council—Mr. W.R. Allen—I am most pleased to see the strong continuing interest in the Waterfront Plan. Since January 10, 1968, week in and week out the Metro Planning Board has been presenting the slide show, talks or information to well over 100 groups.

Planning could be called my avocation and in the 14 years spent on this kind of work, I have never seen any planning action that has had such a strong and continuing hold on the public imagination. Today's headlines are usually in tomorrow's wastepaper basket. It is a rare and satisfying experience to find this Plan as fresh and vital over a year later.

The Waterfront Plan and Metro's future are inextricably locked together for as far into the future as we can see. It is now an accepted part of the land use policy. This means that Metro and the municipalities contained therein will follow this Plan and so protect against the misuses of the past in the future. The Province of Ontario has also lent its support in protecting against misuse of water lots under its control.

This does not mean implementation is guaranteed—far from it. It does mean that the opportunity to implement will be there when organizationally and financially we are ready.

The importance of this Plan in Metro's future is even greater than at the time of its presentation a year ago. This is so because of the recently announced proposals by the Province of Ontario to establish regional governments on the west, north and east boundaries of Metropolitan Toronto.

One obvious result of these proposals—if and when implemented—will be to establish the waterfront to the south as the only direction of potential growth and development.

Of course, the Waterfront Plan, as presented, also envisages—as you have seen—substantial park and other developments on the shorelines of Mississauga Town and Pickering Township and Ajax. For example, the Petticoat Creek Park in Pickering Township was bought by the Metro Toronto and Region Conservation Authority with Metropolitan Toronto as the designated municipality: what happens in these two areas is "up for grabs" as they say—we will not know about this until the Province makes some declaration.

The waterfront in the core area has been already the subject of considerable activity and interest. In addition to the proposed Harbour City we have recently seen the excellent plans proposed by the Canadian National and Canadian Pacific for their substantial land holdings from Bay Street to Bathurst south of Front Street. The Campeau group's Harbour Square proposal is now under review.

The challenge of the Waterfront Plan is being accepted. We must now ensure that best and highest use of the waterfront land results.

So what of Metro's future on the waterfront?

As Mr. W. R. Allen said recently "This thing (the Waterfront Plan) is much bigger than we realize."

As the Plan grows and expands into actuality we should see it take a shape and form that will more and more return the waterfront to the people.

This, however, will only happen if the people continue to demand it and apply pressure to those who can make it happen.

For this reason, I congratulate Dr. Roby Kidd and all of you who organized and are a part of this workshop on your presence here today. By making the Waterfront Plan a part of all students' learning (young and old) for today, you will also have contributed to the waterfront's future.

TODAY'S CHILDREN AND TOMORROW'S WATERFRONT

Barry G. Lowes
Chairman
Metropolitan Toronto School Board

The thing that concerns me as one who is involved in the field of education is that today's children are being swindled out of their future and heritage in many ways.

I have a real feeling for Metro Toronto and it seems as if we "almost do" so many things—our plans never seem to go anywhere . . . There is here today a conspicuous absence of the political person—the person who will get plans operative.

Our children are going to be beneficiaries of what we are discussing today. In the Plan we have a great example for use in our schools; it is not just a waterfront plan but a vehicle for social and community action. How is such a plan created? What steps should we the community take? What better way is there of getting children out of the classroom, to let them begin to see and become involved in the implementation of an important social plan?

Government and its political representatives reflect the desires of the people who elect them; I would hope that OISE and local boards of education could devise the means whereby such action wouldn't be left to the individual teacher—but that it be a concerted effort to get our children exposed to the Plan.

This is certainly one major thing that could grow out of this conference.

CITIZENS AND THEIR WATERFRONT

Donald Middleton
Chairman
Ontario Division, CPAC

I see myself as "Donald Middleton, citizen "—someone who like hundreds of others, came from a farm and arrived in the big city with ambitions to influence things. In my enthusiasm I became a joiner of every possible organization.

Among these was CPAC. It excited me and it still does because through its membership it seems possible for an ordinary citizen to gain a sense of belonging and participation in his community (and that is what I personally crave). Also through membership in an organization such as CPAC a citizen soon finds out that he must stretch his concern beyond his personal interests to the needs of others. As an ex-farm boy, I have strong in me the need to escape back to the open countryside. But even though I personally may be able to get in my car and go, I have concern for the people who cannot escape the city.

For all such people (and it may well include me when my driving days are over) the recreation facilities of the Metro Waterfront are very precious; and since they are so precious, it is of the utmost importance to find out how citizens would like this land to be developed.

It is not good enough for politicians to send up a balloon in the form of a Waterfront Conceptual Plan and to say "If the citizens don't shoot it down then that is just what they want." That is citizen participation on a very low plane and is not enough. Nor is it good enough for government to set up situations which in essence trick citizens into complying with what the powers-that-be intended to do in the first place. We have all been caught in that situation at one time or another. It is as if government said to the citizen "Don't worry, we will do your dreaming for you," but the government forgets that the citizen may have some dreams of his own.

How do we get governments and citizens to share their dreams? To do this, government must be willing to take citizen involvement seriously; it requires something more than mere acceptance of government plans.

The waterfront contains dreams which can be shared. Not only are there the dreams of individuals, but there are definite communities of citizen interest available for consultation: I am thinking of yacht clubs, the power boat squadron, bird watchers, and other groups with natural affinity. I know that some attempt to consult these groups has been made through the Metro Waterfront Advisory Committee—a body on which CPAC also has representation. But it seems that this Advisory Committee is being ignored or by-passed because there were some head-on clashes of opinion within it. Government has to live with such diversities of opinion and try to resolve them, not just sweep them under the rug. People's dreams—just ordinary people's dreams—*are* important in the planning of our cities, and at this workshop let us try to remember that beyond the careful intellectual approach of all of us here today, there is the "man in the street" who, whether we like it or not, will cast votes "yes or no" for the representatives of government, who in turn will decide what is to become of our waterfront. Let [illegible] make sure that that man has a chance to know the issues and a chance to voice his dreams.

THE METROPOLITAN TORONTO WATERFRONT PLAN: AN ADVENTURE IN LEARNING?

D. McCormack Smyth
Dean
Atkinson College
York University

The pamphlet describing the Metropolitan Toronto Waterfront Plan contains some historical background which begins with the following statement: "Toronto is what it is and where it is because of its waterfront." That is an interesting statement which could be examined fruitfully from a variety of points of view. I would like to suggest another statement: "Toronto is what it is and where it is because of what its people have done and because of what its people have not done. The waterfront has influenced the people and the people have influenced the waterfront." The question before us is "How will planning for the waterfront be affected by the citizens of Toronto in the future and how will the citizens be affected by the plans for the waterfront?"

Any city is what it is and where it is not only for environmental reasons but also for a host of human reasons.

I begin with the assumption that the purpose of the Waterfront Plan is to improve the circumstances of and to increase opportunities for community life for individuals in Metropolitan Toronto. No plan for the waterfront should be or in reality can be developed without taking into careful account the needs, the aspirations, and the wishes of individual people. One of the central questions is the extent to which those who will be affected by the plans will have an opportunity to participate in the development, the refinement, and the implementation of the plans.

A long time ago Thomas Jefferson, speaking on the functions of government, said that "The care of human life and happiness is the first and only legitimate object of good government." I assume that all of us are in favor of good government. Thus I also assume that in all of our planning we wish to give first place to the care of human life and happiness.

My experience in organizational and community planning, however, has led me to the conclusion that all too often in civic and organizational planning, the assumed excellence of our administrative and physical plans and the enthusiasm for them which seizes some of us, particularly when overall plans for physical structures are presented, blurs our appreciation of the need to consult with individuals and to draw them into the planning process.

Some of you may be familiar with the work of the Full Circle Associates in New York City. This group of individuals launched a program of summer activity in relation to a number of community centers in Manhattan in 1964. Their objective was to use the talents of artists and volunteers in a variety of spontaneous activities that would aid individual residents within the poorer areas of Manhattan in their understanding of their own uniqueness and their abilities to contribute to the solution of their own problems. Robert J. Fox, the moving spirit behind the original plan which led to the development of the Full Circle Associates, has noted that there are two theories which are currently popular concerning the inner city. He says that the first is the theory that all the poor people need, is help—and the best way to help them is to approach them in the traditional manner of the social worker to assist individuals to adjust to the circumstances in which they find themselves. The second approach, says Fox, is to conclude that the inner city is so bad that it is unlivable and ought to be destroyed either by bulldozing or by rioting. That there is a third way which needs to be tried is emphasized by Fox and his colleagues. That third approach is the organized approach of creating circumstances which will persuade people to reveal their inner riches and enable them to face their problems. Individual people who are motivated can make the difference.

Thus I suggest to you that the creation and the implementation of a Metropolitan Toronto Waterfront Plan should be "an adventure in learning." It should be an adventure in learning in two specific ways. First, it should involve a serious effort on the part of those who develop the plan to learn about the needs of the individual people who will be affected by the plan. Second, the plan itself should be so devised that as the plan is implemented it will contribute to the creation of an environment in which individuals will be challenged to engage in the exciting undertaking of continuous learning. Thereby they should be enabled to contribute in turn to the life of the community in which they live.

What I have to say falls into two parts:

First: What should those who are developing the plan learn about the needs of those who will be affected by the plan?

Second: What elements should be built into the plan which will facilitate an interest in continuous learning?

A long time ago, Alexis deTocqueville in his "Democracy in America" wrote that: "No sooner do you set foot upon American ground than you are stunned by a kind of tumult...a confused clamour is heard on every side, and a thousand simultaneous voices demand the satisfaction of their social wants." In the same volume deTocqueville wrote: "I regard the size of some American cities and especially the nature of their inhabitants as a real danger threatening the future of the democratic republics of the New World, and I should not hesitate to predict that it is through them (the cities) that they will perish, unless their government succeeds in creating an armed force which, while remaining subject to the wishes of the national majority, is independent of the people of the towns and capable of suppressing their excesses."[1] That prophetic statement concerning the unrest which has arisen in the great cities of America and the echoes of the rampaging and the bombing which occurred in Montreal just a few days ago, should shock us into the realization that more than planning and the realization of planning are necessary. Our planning must be related not to the assumed needs of people, but to the actual needs of people.

In their article on "The Voice of the People" in the volume Citizen Participation in Urban Development, Peter Marris and Martin Rein, have noted that: "Research, planning, co-ordination must seem remote answers to a rat-infested tenement, the inquisitorial harassment of a welfare inspector, debts and the weary futility of killing time on the streets."[2] However, it is precisely for such people who experience these things that care should be taken. Such people have a variety of characteristics which need to be remembered when plans are being developed, in part, to meet their needs. In considerable measure these people: are overwhelmed by the demands of daily living; are continually affected by varieties of crises; tend to lack self-confidence and often any sense that they are able to influence in any way the course of their lives; not have adequate knowledge or information; lack appropriate leadership; and need institutions and organizations which might be able to develop incentives on the part of low income people, institutions which are not insulated from their needs.

Now it may be argued that the poor and others affected by the planning of the new waterfront do not have the knowledge or ability to contribute to planning. On the contrary there is abundant literature to indicate that the poor can participate effectively in the work of policy-making boards, that they can participate as staff members of agencies concerned with the development of plans for the renewal and the development of urban communities. The unfortunate situation is, of course, that the involvement of those affected by the planning has to date been quite limited.

There have been occasions, of course, on which the poor have been solicited for their views concerning their own needs. In other circumstances planners have been persuaded to incorporate certain elements in their plans as a result of threats of militant leaders of the inarticulate poor. All in all, however, there has been little opportunity to put to the test the thesis that those who are affected by planning could perform an important function in the whole of the planning enterprise. What is needed is more than an arrangement whereby those who are affected by the plan can define their needs or react to plans which have already been formulated.

---

[1] Alexis deTocqueville, Democracy in America, Translation by George George Lawrence (New York: Harper & Row, 1966), p. 256 note 1

[2] Citizen Participation in Urban Development, Vol. I Concepts & Issues, Ed. Hans B.C. Spiegel, "The Voice of the People," by Peter Marris and Martin Rein, p. 129.

Needless to say, there are a whole variety of obstacles to the participation of those who are affected by the planning, in the planning itself. The first obstacle is the apathy which is so widespread on the part of those who are affected by planning. The second obstacle is the absence of satisfactory relationships between the planners and those who are members of the community. At the same time there is the strong desire on the part of the professional planners and others involved in making the key decisions regarding plans, to see their own plans and ideas implemented. Sometimes the plans are presented in such theoretical and professional terms that those who are affected by the plans are unable to understand sufficiently the nature of the plans and how they will affect them as individuals.

If the participation of those who are to be affected by physical planning is to be more than perfunctory, then time and money should be invested to ensure that the plans as they are created, refined, and implemented do in fact reflect the felt needs of the large number of individuals whose lives will be influenced for better or for worse by the plans.

If people do not participate in the creation or the refining of plans, then they will tend to a greater or lesser degree, to feel no sense of responsibility regarding the plans. Non-participation leads to alienation. It was Martin Luther King who described alienation as "the acid of despair that dissolves society." Participation today is a word that is being used in a variety of ways. We hear on many sides the cry for participatory democracy. That cry must be balanced by emphasis on participatory responsibility. If we are to have a sense of responsibility, however, we must also have a sense of participation. One might describe participation as one's ability or one's opportunity to contribute fully as a member of the progressive community.

Thus I emphasize the importance of participation in the planning enterprise by those who will be affected by the plans as they are implemented.

At the professional level there are also a host of problems to be confronted. Some of these problems were outlined in one of the last essays of Catherine Bauer Wurster, who was one of the leaders in housing and community planning in the United States during the last half century. She wrote:

> Modern metropolitan trends have destroyed the traditional concept of urban structure, and there is no new image to take its place. Blind forces push in various directions, while urban environments are being shaped by decisions which are not based on any real

> understanding of cause-and-effect nor geared to consistent purposes . . . the problems cannot be solved piecemeal by ad hoc decisions unrelated to any clear consensus about public purposes. Costly conflicts must be resolved, alternative directions identified, and the nature of the big choices, which tend to come in packages, thoroughly understood.

The Metropolitan Toronto Waterfront Plan is a big package. Its implications for learning should be thoroughly understood.

In his book "The Revolution of Hope," Erich Fromm has noted that all planning is directed by value judgments and by norms set by professional people whether or not the planners are aware of it.[1]

I assume that all of us would agree with Fromm that the general aim of a humanized industrial society should be to ensure that changes in the social, economic, and cultural life of our society, occur in those ways which will stimulate and further the growth and aliveness of individual human beings rather than crippling them. Fromm emphasized, and I am sure all of us would agree, that man and not plans must be the ultimate source of values.

One basic necessity for the well being of the individual is to be active in helpful ways. Above all the individual must not be merely active in the physical sense; he must be active mentally and spiritually. One of the most unfortunate circumstances of our time is that increasingly the organization of life in the technopolitan community tends to make the individual more passive. It is my view that our technopolitan communities should stimulate men not to be passive but to be active in learning and in thinking—in relating to one another. Thus it is my hope that in the planning for the new waterfront community that attention will be given to the provision of facilities which will aid in the activization of the minds and spirits of individuals rather than extending their passiveness. In this connection I have a number of specific proposals to make.

I believe as plans are developed for the Metropolitan Toronto Waterfront that specific attention should be directed to the ways in which this new plan will increase the opportunities for individuals, whose mother tongue is neither English nor French, to participate in the development of the community of which they are members. In this regard we should remind ourselves that we in Canada, particularly in the English-speaking part of Canada, have not given sufficient attention to the establishment of means of social promotion for individuals whose mother tongue is not English. Constantly I believe we should be asking ourselves whether it is just that the circumstances in our communities should be such as to condemn many people who have particular qualities which are needed in our communities to the menial tasks in our communities. Here I think, of course, of the large number of citizens and children of Italian, Slavic, and Baltic origins in Toronto who have the ability to continue their studies to advanced levels but do not have the opportunity. In this connection I believe it is essential that we ask ourselves whether plans for the new waterfront community will contribute to the increasing distraction and passiveness of individuals or whether it will contribute to the increasing intellectual and spiritual activization of individuals.

---

[1] See Erich Fromm, The Revolution of Hope, p.95

Specifically I note that in the objectives of the Metropolitan Toronto Waterfront Plan, no reference is made to the provision of special facilities for learning. Particular attention of course is directed toward recreational activities. I believe that equal emphasis should be given to the "re-creational" activities which should play an important part if the Waterfront Plan is to develop correctly. I believe, for instance, that there should be established as part of the Metropolitan Toronto Waterfront Plan provision for a four-year college as an integral part of the plan.[1] In addition I believe substantial facilities for the continuing education of adults should be planned as part of the new waterfront development.

If steps could be taken toward the provision of facilities for a four-year college, this might stimulate thought regarding the desirable formation of a new university in Toronto which could develop on the federal principle through the bringing together of a number of existing institutions, such as Ryerson Polytechnical Institute, the Ontario College of Art, the Community Colleges, and the Schools of Nursing. This has been done in New York City and could very well be done in Toronto. Just as New York has its Columbia University and Toronto has the University of Toronto, and just as New York has New York University and Toronto has York University, similarly Metropolitan Toronto needs a Metropolitan university which might well be patterned on the City University of New York. The basis already exists in Metropolitan Toronto for the creation of a third major agency for the meeting of the higher learning needs of our community. What we need to do now is to take steps to integrate the efforts of existing institutions—perhaps in a new organizational form. This might begin, for instance, through the association together of certain institutions of learning into a grouping which might be called the Associated Colleges of Metropolitan Toronto and which might ultimately emerge as the Metropolitan University of Toronto.

---

[1] See Proposed Plan for Toronto, prepared by the City of Toronto Planning Board, June 1967, page 78.

By bringing together the activities of such institutions of post-secondary education as Ryerson, the Ontario College of Art, the Community Colleges, Schools of Nursing and perhaps bringing into the proposed federation the new four-year college which has been indicated as being necessary in Toronto in the 1970's, the basis could be established for a new Metropolitan University. Perhaps other institutions, such as The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education and other colleges already operating, should be drawn into such a federation. The purpose of integrating the efforts of existing institutions and the new institution which it is estimated will be required, should be for the continuing human, economic, and social development of Metropolitan Toronto. There is in Metropolitan Toronto enormous potential, there is also enormous need. Our requirement is for a plan for the integration of the efforts of those who have the potential and are able to contribute to meeting the need.

In addition to making provision for facilities for formal educational programs as part of the new Waterfront Plan, attention should also be directed to provision for special facilities for the reception and integration into the life of our community of newcomers from Europe and Asia. Certain limited services are provided already for these groups including the important work done through the International Institute of Metropolitan Toronto. The work of that Institute needs to be expanded and supported to a much greater degree than it is at present. Specific attention should be given to the integration into our community of individuals who have special professional and technical capabilities. We need in Metropolitan Toronto the equivalent of the professional advisory council for immigrants which operates in New York City. Through the auspices of this organization individuals who have specialized skills are enabled to begin making the optimum contribution to their new community in the shortest possible time. Special steps need to be taken so that not only the individuals with professional abilities but the Metropolitan Toronto community as a whole may benefit through the early participation of such specialized people in the ongoing work of the community.

We must not, however, be totally preoccupied with the needs of the professionals. Special steps must be taken to ensure that all newcomers are aided in the best possible ways so that they may become oriented culturally and vocationally to their new life in our midst.

There appears to be urgent need for the establishment of an institute for human environmental development in Metropolitan Toronto. Such an institute should be established to coordinate and integrate the rapidly increasing number of publicly supported programs designed to assist in various aspects of human development in our community. If such an institute could be brought into being as part of the planning agency responsibile for the development of the Metropolitan Toronto Waterfront Plan, considerable savings might be effected and the processes of human development humanized and made more effective at the same time. Such an institute might itself be based, as the International Institute of Metropolitan Toronto should be based perhaps, in the new waterfront development.

These are just a few ways in which I believe steps could and should be taken to ensure that the new Waterfront Plan contributes on a continuing basis to human development in the Metropolitan Toronto community. In the final analysis, if the Plan does not contribute to human development I would assume that the central purpose of the Plan will have been missed. None of us would like this to happen. We must act now in positive ways to ensure that the Metropolitan Toronto Waterfront Plan becomes an exciting and humane undertaking—An Adventure in Learning—in the interests of all the citizens of our community.

THE WATERFRONT IS FOR LIVING AND LEARNING

Those who feared that the study of the waterfront alone might obscure the totality of our city's growth, would have been cheered by the trends that the workshop discussion actually took. They would have heard how one group came to see that like the waterfront, the rivers that flow down to Lake Ontario through Metro, are part of the ecological and social wholeness of the area; in another group they would have heard of the need for a cost-benefit analysis to relate waterfront development to local assessment needs; and in every group they would have heard talk of the jurisdictional tangles that beset the Waterfront Plan and they would have seen how through the Plan, group members gained a new and more personal insight into federal, provincial, and municipal relations.

There were two statements concerning waterfront development that caused far-ranging thoughts. One said: "Nobody (i.e., the public) feels threatened by the loss of the waterfront because nobody owns it . . . it lacks the 'what's in it for me' appeal that a few homeowners can work up." It followed from this that in the vagueness of "public interest" as opposed to the directness of the "developer's interest" there are no generally accepted objectives or priorities concerning waterfront use. Hence, when a plan, or a developer's proposal is presented, there is no yardstick to measure its worth or priority. Such objectives need to be set forth and given publicity for the benefit of both the public and the developers.

Against the "nobody feels threatened" line was another speaker's opening statement: "I have never seen a planning action that has such a strong and continuing hold on the public imagination . . . We have got hold of something bigger than we know." And along with that was the comment of a group member: "Of course the interest is there—interest in a beach and water is with us from childhood; what we haven't found out is how to grab it."

And away went all five groups on a multitude of suggestions as to how to engender and how to curb the "What's in it for me" approach, and how to grab, and who to grab. The proposals ranged from Sunday tours and a mobile trailer exhibit, to the involvement possibilities in libraries, schools, youth groups, colleges, museums, art galleries and all communications media on through to "brain storming," "town talk," and all the mechanics of group dynamics. The concern was no longer for the waterfront itself but for if and how people of a huge sprawling metropolis can come to feel that they "belong." The waterfront was found to be "special" simply because of the diversity of its appeal, and the Plan was found to be the means of focusing public interest and making at least one part of urban growth comprehensible.

And what of the relevancy of the Plan to an Institute which is concerned with advanced studies in education? In one group there was a dialogue between a professor, a journalist, and a planner as to the extent to which a university through its staff and students, should become involved in local affairs. This led to a statement that a university's most useful involvement in local affairs was through studies and research of the local problems and that its contribution would be far more useful if the "tools" (records and minutes showing the thinking behind the decisions) were more easily available to them. "And why," it was asked "is it so much easier to obtain these tools from the United States than from our own governments?" "Could a team of post-graduate students from a variety of disciplines such as the social sciences, architecture, planning, history, law, medicine, biology, be given the means to investigate and see if a breakthrough could be made in the problem of why we get so bogged down?" "Could some central body facilitate the problem in the case of the Metro Waterfront by being the focal point for such needed information?"

In every group, the question of a "Central Agency for the Metro Waterfront" was debated. The discussion dealt not so much with the jurisdictional powers of an Authority or Commission, but with the need for an "initiating body" that could be the focus of public involvement both as to "input" and "output"—one that had the funds and administrative machinery to carry on the sort of public relations activities that CPAC can initiate but is not strong enough to carry out. Also, as one member put it, this body need not have the power to move earth, but the power to move heaven and earth; to make available the decision-making type of materials—the records of the *thinking* behind previous decisions and the choices that are open now. It was suggested that these are needed by one level of government about decisions at other levels; for Canadian research projects and, in a different form, for the public at large. Coupled with these suggestions were the questions: "Through what voice can the public speak?" "What is the function of the elected representative?"

The desire for choice—for alternatives, rather than the "take it or leave it" presentation of experts, was a consistently expressed topic at the workshop. At least one group took issue with the statement of a member of the Metro Planning staff that the waterfront dictated its own uses and did not lend itself to choice. This group felt that in a very general way that might be true since the shore contours, the bluffs, and the river mouths might dictate certain uses, as did the needs of the Port, but that within that there were many possibilities for choice such as the type of parks, the selection of uses on public land, and the types of residential development; also design alternatives that preserve the public's access to the water compared with those that provide maximum assessment. The need to express these choices in a way that the public can understand was seen as the job, not of technical experts, but of those whose training is to do just that, the educationists. The Plan then becomes an instrument for involvement for a mass study on urban development.

GROUP I

Chairman: *Macklin Hancock*

Recorder: *Margaret Bizzell*

Members:
Graham Adams
E. Mattyasovszky
Donald W. Middleton
D. McCormack Smyth
Joyce Watson

Preliminary discussion in this group concerned the Plan itself: later, its educational potential was considered.

Initial reaction to the Plan was good: it was stated by one member that it will be one of the very best in North America. However, several major deficiencies were identified:

a) As a Plan the Waterfront was thought to be isolated from its hinterland: it was "too hard at the edges." As a consequence of this rigidity the group felt that there was danger of several undesirable outcomes. (i) The Waterfront Plan, if developed in isolation, would not be "plugged into the continuous ecological circuit" formed by the river valleys, the lakeshore, and the lake. (ii) Also, in human terms, the "hard edges" of the present Waterfront Plan did not have "the sense of overall community that an ecologically oriented plan would have had," i.e., it lacks the sense of community that it would have had if it could have extended up the river valleys and thus encourage the people to identify with their Waterfront. There was disappointment that as yet the Plan was very circumscribed with little evidence of connection with larger human or physical values.

b) This led to the second criticism which was that the Plan, as presented, did not invite sufficient citizen involvement. For instance, there had been no alternatives suggested for public consideration; e.g., "Do we want to have a very manicured front or park, promenade-type development? or a thread of continuous ecological connection in which bridges or urban activity could cross natural wilderness areas so that people could have access to a natural edge between land and water without destroying it? or a grand residential area?" It was urged that confrontation and controversy in such matters were needed to involve the public. Such questions might make suitable election platforms! It was brought out that the public hearings, such as those held by the Metro Planning Board, can cope with objections from citizens but that that is a far cry from participation in the planning process.

Ensuing discussion then focused on why the public does not become involved. It was suggested that planners lack confidence in involving people in planning; also that our system is weighted toward the vested interests, that it is only vested interests, e.g., developers, who have pinpointed areas of focus and will therefore make it their business to gain access to information, upon which they can act. Education of the public appears to be the best antidote.

The Educational Potential of the Plan

The group thought that involvement of the public in the planning and building stages should be regarded as a learning stage crucial to the whole development of the city.

Various aspects of developing a learning process, using the Waterfront Plan as a vehicle, were then considered.

Extended involvement in the planning and building process would facilitate learning of how to relate oneself to the environment, how communities function, citizen participation, and so on.

The point was raised that there might be reaction to learning about a process through which someone else was getting rich.

It was suggested that this could be regarded as part of the learning process. The citizen would become aware of the relationship between the various decision-making levels, e.g., federal, provincial, etc., and would come to understand more of his own relationship to his government.

The group considered the involvement of the present school population of prime importance. It was suggested that students from universities, CAATs, Ryerson, high schools, and so on, could become involved in the actual implementation of the Plan. This could take the shape of community development work, or working with areas such as the group of homeowners opposed to a particular phase of the Plan. The group was also enthusiastic about the idea of encouraging students to make their own movies about developments. Members felt that the introduction of post-secondary courses on ecological systems in communities with the Waterfront Plan as the focus of attention would benefit both the students and the future city.

Publicity so far was judged sporadic and it was recommended that it be pulled together and aimed at the encouragement of involvement and learning. It was suggested that the business community make its contribution of 50 percent of the publicity costs to develop wider use of general advertising, billboards, boat trips, and so on, extended use of an improved slide show, the production of movies on the Waterfront Plan at all stages (the commercial cinemas are suffering from a lack of shorts, and a series of such shorts on the Waterfront Plan would be an ideal way of disseminating information); displays at the Centennial Science Exhibition, at the Provincial show at the CNE; involvement of ETV; more intensive work by the libraries on disseminating information on the whole project.

GROUP II

Chairman: *Alex Murray*

Recorder: *Ann McKenzie*

Members:
Rosemary Dudley
Frank Crann
Jack Jones
John Marshall
Cliff McIntosh
Ross Munro
V.W. Rudick
Jeffery Stinson
Barry Zwicker

The session opened with the statement that the general public is not aware of the Metropolitan Toronto Waterfront Plan.

Discussion centered around ways of informing the public, and mechanisms that would develop their interest and participation: more community meetings; involving the group in the seminar; universities designing courses around the theme; schools could diffuse the information through the children to the parents; teaching urban geography with field trips to the waterfront; promoting union involvement; including in the immediate environment such institutions as the Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology; getting more media coverage.

The general feeling was that there are many problems which will be encountered in promoting these concepts, the principal one being the lack of any central governing body with enough authority, strength, and resources to attack the issues.

From this discussion it became clear that some universities and several schools had courses on urban affairs. They had encountered problems in obtaining information from the appropriate authorities. The university could plan courses and faculties around urban planning. Traditionally they were not interested in community confrontation, only in objective viewing. Even the university year precludes student involvement, over a long term.

An issue was raised in discussing the professors lack of feeding information to the press.

There was general agreement that the most important question was "What's in it for me?", and that the most important measure was to sell "What's in it for people?". Consequently citizen participation was necessary even if it meant modifying the concept. An important but unresolved question was "How could other industries besides developers become interested in taking an active part though not at the risk of forgetting the priority of citizen's needs?" Private developers create an immediate citizen interest by having an issue that draws the public attention. Plans such as Campeau's or that of the Toronto Telegram develop knowledge of details, but not of the issues.

Citizen representation is necessary to arouse response. The representatives, both politicians and civil servants, were not speaking out on general issues. This led to a discussion on lack of provincial political involvement. The response was that an over-all agency was needed to solve all the problems. The thirty-two agencies involved could only make a statement on the small parts of the plan which they administered. They were also hindered by basic economic issues.

The group considered further ways that each individual member could take the ideas discussed back to their own locales. They arrived at these nine conclusions:

1) Find Canadian-researched models to give students.

2) Provide opportunities for Urban Study students to see minutes of the meetings where the decisions are made, and have civil servants and politicians discuss the issues.

3) Find ways of approaching the Metro Planning Board.

4) Have a team of graduate students study the problem.

5) Interest the Royal Ontario Museum, the Art Gallery, and so on, in mounting exhibitions.

6) Let schools focus their community studies of local ecological problems.

7) Approach managing editors directly for wider news coverage.

8) Make the public realize that it is *their* waterfront.

9) Give public boat tours of the waterfront so that they have a concept of the Plan.

The consensus was that the original waterfront design was made interesting to the public, which resulted in a modification of the Plan, using their suggestions.

Now a central authority must be named to coordinate the Plan. The coordinator will have the sources of information and personnel to inform the public and include their ideas in the inevitable modifications of an ongoing project.

GROUP III

Chairman: *Ruth Eisen*

Recorder: *Elizabeth Smith*

Members:
Keith Bain
C.L. Blair
Tom Reid Burnett
David R. Cole
Frank Longstaff
Leo Maarse
Colin McAndrew
Ernest Tonge

A. Citizen Participation

Members agreed to focus the discussion initially on citizen participation in the waterfront project. Representatives of the Planning Board acquainted us with the group which had already become involved—namely CPAC which had provided the present impetus; special-interest groups such as boaters, swimmers, and naturalists; public agencies and elected representatives. These were referred to as groups or individuals with a direct or vested interest.

In looking at how to increase participation or, in other words, how to reach the population with an indirect interest, the following proposals were put forward:

1) Maintain and build on contacts with elected representatives.

2) Approach youth by speaking their language, appealing to their activist tendencies and encouraging them to utilize their power to contribute to creative decision-making in community planning.

3) Work through, strengthen, and encourage expansion of involved special interest groups (such as boaters, swimmers, etc.) It was felt that these should be looked upon as seeding devices or catalysts.

4) Improve and liven the slide presentation of the project. This could be accomplished by adding both color and animation. Since citizens are unaccustomed to being able to influence community projects, it was underlined that one of the unique features in the case of the waterfront is that citizen opinions and suggestions are really wanted. During discussions of the Plan, it should be stressed that the Plan is a proposal on which to build.

There was some suggestion that perhaps the "man in the street" needed to be threatened before he could be motivated to participate in or react to any project. However, the general feeling was that creative and positive approaches appealing to his imagination could be developed. Some of these approaches could, for example, relate waterfront planning to pollution control. It was also proposed that groups such as Boy Scouts and School Boards be asked to say what facilities they would want provided along the waterfront.

Finally, it was stressed that more citizens need to be involved right away and that this should be a continuing or ongoing process. Valuable lessons can be learned by experimenting with various plans to increase involvement. In our democratic society where so much power is vested in the hands of a few, we might in this way discover methods which will provide instantaneous feedback, thus exemplifying necessary checks and balances which could be built into our political system.

B. Responsibilities of Educationists

The group's definition of educationist was a broad one which included the informal educator as well as the educator employed in accredited institutions. Thus the definition embraced all persons concerned with growth and change in the community.

In considering their roles and responsibilities the group was not only expressing opinions but also making recommendations.

1) Educators must be informed about and have opinions on the waterfront. Their role is seen as one whereby they would expose citizens, associates, or learners to the advantages and disadvantages of several alternatives.

2) They must bring people to the waterfront and follow such trips with discussions or projects.

3) They must become partners in planning.

4) They must teach learners to become active, involved, and participating citizens.

Not only should our educational system be revised to incorporate such learnings at a very early age, but learning experiences of this kind should be developed for young and old alike.

GROUP IV

Chairman: *Ross Lord*

Recorder: *Joanne Kidd*

Members: *James A. Draper*
A.L. Milloy
J.O. Spender
W. Trimble
James Walker
T. Weatherall

Key Issues

1) A single authority should be set up comprised of representatives of municipal, provincial, and federal levels of government.

2) Greater awareness is required among politicians, thus "briefing meetings" should be held for both federal and provincial members for waterfront constituencies and others in Metro.

3) Greater communication between levels of government should be facilitated.

4) Pollution control should begin at once and be implemented concurrently with waterfront development. Assistance should be sought from the Ontario Water Resources Commission.

5) The financial aspects of the Plan should be clarified, e.g., development should lead to greater tax revenues which will help offset cost. A cost-benefit study should be done.

6) Action on the Plan is imperative. This means public support which will come only with education. A committee of the CPAC should be created to promote public education in relation to such projects.

7) There is a responsibility to share the knowledge of the developmental process of planning for people on the international scene.

8) The creation of an environment should remain the major role of the waterfront plan, leaving the door open to formal educational institutions but emphasizing opportunities for informal learning.

Dr. Lord opened the meeting by reading parts of a paper he had prepared in connection with his official role as Chairman of the Metropolitan Toronto and Region Conservation Authority. This led into a discussion on the need for consolidation of authority. Issues were: a) the need for acquisition of land, which can best be achieved by a unified body; b) the question of ownership of the land that is being filled; c) the need for one body if federal financial support is to be elicited (a single authority would create a more accessible channel of communication that would be representative).

Examples cited as prototypes were the St. Lawrence Seaway Commission, the Niagara Parks Commission, the National Capital Commission, and Conservation Authorities of Ontario. The problems that amalgamation would cause the Toronto Harbour Commissioners were cited, since they would have to project the amount of space necessary for the future and then be frozen. It was pointed out that they are virtually frozen now by the islands but that additional harbour facilities could be created by excavation.

The second issue was the educational possibilities of the waterfront. The idea of an immigration center, which had been mentioned in the morning session, was considered unnecessary and not suitable for the waterfront. The establishment of an international university was proposed. There was emphasis on the fact that public property was available with potential for human usage. It was suggested that the waterfront improvements would spread into the city in the same way that a modern school often foreshadows improvement in a slum area. The resources for pollution and conservation education and for giving city children contact with nature were pointed out. The need to share learning regarding the development and planning processes was indicated. The need to create an environment for learning was reiterated.

The necessity to control pollution if recreation is to be feasible was brought out. United States anti-pollution legislation currently under consideration was mentioned. Cost of Chicago lakefront pollution control was cited ($100 million/mile).

This led into further discussion of the need for federal and provincial involvement. Pollution and the fact that nearly one-third of the Canadian population is expected to reside in the Toronto area by 1980 were indicated as factors which should lead to federal concern. The need for more effective interlinking of levels of government was also pointed out here.

A major factor in the success of the plan was felt to be support and involvement of both the politicians and the public. The recommendation for an action committee of CPAC grew out of the belief that it was necessary to create awareness which would lead to support and then involvement, the latter being a kind of emotional commitment. To achieve this, a simplified communication of the plan was felt to be needed. The analogy to Expo and its effect on Montreal was mentioned more than once. The group saw the waterfront concept as having the same potential for generating enthusiasm. Concern was expressed that seeming lack of enthusiasm by Metro politicians meant delay in implementation which resulted in a "bogging down." The slowing effect this has in relation to acquisition of land, a matter of some urgency, was noted. The need to control the development and ensure that it occurs in the most desirable possible way was mentioned. The action of individuals after they left the conference was seen as a positive factor in the advancement of the plan.

Discussion of financial aspects included cost of pollution control and projected tax assessment. The fact that the Harbour Commissioners feel they can pay for airport development by sale of improved land was pointed out. The influence and interests of the private developer were considered. Some members felt that developers would be open to encouragement to consider the potential of the plan and to develop with educational and technological needs in mind. The attractiveness to tenants of educational facilities was suggested as a factor in convincing developers of the usefulness of this. Others considered that developers might feel that the most attractive thing to tenants might be to exclude the public and that desire to get tenants would be the motivation for any developer's action. The initial idea of a single authority was returned to when several agreed that only such an authority could ensure acceptable development.

GROUP V

Chairman: *R.F. Stackhouse*

Recorder: *June Yew*

Members: *E.F. Anderson*
R. John Bower
Jack Eilbeck
Bruce Falls
Myrna Knechtel
Saeed Quazi
Malcolm Sykes
A. Wilkinson

The group identified four major issues on education for the development of Toronto's waterfront: 1) the natural environment; 2) the different levels of jurisdictional responsibilities; 3) the human aspect of urban development; 4) transportation facilities.

The Natural Environment

The fear of the degradation of natural areas into mere recreational parks was expressed. The point was made that the public has a tendency to desire easily accessible picnic grounds with recreational facilities in preference to a more natural and less accessible environment. Whilst on the one hand some may desire that scenic variety be encouraged and the natural areas be left as untampered as possible, on the other hand, population density together with public demand may leave the planner with no choice but to develop recreational parks.

Educational Implications

Educational efforts in this area should seek to develop in both adults and children a "feel for nature" and a regard for the "quality of environment." Children could be transported to nature to give them sufficient time to "absorb and integrate" with the natural environment; farm schools, like the one on Centre Island, should be encouraged; the public should be given a chance to enjoy the marine facilities so abundant in the Waterfront Plan; courses on boating should be given and "public" yacht clubs be encouraged.

Legal Jurisdiction

The group saw three main problems here: 1) the overlap of legal jurisdiction by the various municipalities and authorities involved; 2) the hiatus between government and the public; 3) the concerns of the local authorities against those of the regional authorities.

The development of Toronto's waterfront had been talked about for some ten years now. The difficulty of coordinating local councils and government authorities was recognized. The drawing up of the Plan alone required active participation and cooperation from different federal and regional departments each responsible to their own department. To put the plan into effect requires even more sustained cooperation and understanding. Would it not be more realistic and efficient to place this responsibility in the hands of a new agency, independent of and superceding local councils and local authorities such as Ontario Hydro or the Niagara Parks Commission?

There was debate over this question. Some felt that the implementation of the Plan must be democratically done and that this principle should not be dropped simply to solve the jurisdictional problem. The suggestion was made that perhaps the boundaries of a city, and its jurisdiction should be based in terms of planning units rather than on area and population.

Human Aspect of Urban Development

The questions raised on the educational aspect of human development were: 1) How to involve more people to participate more actively in the waterfront development? 2) How to extend to the general public this "sense of stewardship" and responsibility that the waterfront planners have. How can they ensure that Toronto's waterfront will not be exploited by the few but will be used for all? 3) How to make the best use of existing facilities for educating the mass of people who are not reached by talks to various clubs and councils?

Several answers were suggested each calling for ways of involving more people in the waterfront project.

1. The Plan itself should be the center and instrument of a mass study on urban development and the city. Universities, community colleges, and high schools should make it part of their curricula.

2. The opinion of the "man-on-the-street" should be solicited. What, for example, does he want from a waterfront park? Discussion groups could be formed and provide the springboard to further educational activities.

3. Publicity from now on should be centered on the general public and to children who will be the beneficiaries of the Plan. Educational programs should be forward-looking in perspective and should aim at developing a sound opinion regarding urbanization for the future.

4. A trailer, with models, slides, and sound effects could be stationed in various parts of the country from Port Credit to Pickering.

5. The members of the group were concerned that the opinions of senior citizens seem to have been left out, as were the opinions of New Canadians. Will our senior citizens be more interested in passive, quiet visual pleasures and if so, what has been done to include this in the Plan?

6. The Waterfront Plan must allow for schools, workshops, colleges, and theaters.

Transportation

The group touched on: a) transportation facilities for the elderly; b) the possibility of local transportation in the parks; c) the possibility of special rates of public transportation for children; d) the problem of massive parking.

The point was raised that the development area must be integrated into the whole Metro area, and that careful consideration be given to the choice of longitudinal or latitudinal thoroughfares so as to cause the least amount of spatial division.

AND WHAT OF THE FUTURE?

CPAC, a citizen organization and OISE, a government institution, have the same ultimate aim regarding the Waterfront but they will reach it by different paths: for both, the ultimate aim is that people may live more fully in an urban setting, but CPAC will work to create a better environment while OISE will try to enable people through learning, to enter more fully into that environment. The CPAC approach increases people's capacity to live better; for OISE, the waterfront and its planning offers to people the opportunity to learn better and thus to become more adequate in urban surroundings. For CPAC the emphasis will be on living. For OISE the emphasis will be on learning. The programs which each are developing will differ in emphasis but will be complementary to each other. In these programs, both OISE and CPAC must have as a starting point a broad base of people and institutions who "think Waterfront." Both OISE and CPAC will be searching for sources of revenue and both will be relying heavily on the communications media.

But the methods will differ: CPAC will be concerned with general promotion, a groundswell of involvement among many types of organizations and among individuals who have a direct interest in the waterfront and its planning; OISE, meanwhile, will continue to be concerned about opportunities for education made possible by the Plan, through courses offered by various institutions, research, presentation through use of the educational technologies, and evaluation of learning associated with citizen participation.

In the planning of programs the emphasis of CPAC and OISE will differ, the contribution of the media relative to OISE and CPAC will differ and so will the general tempo and priorities in the long-term program. The steps presently being taken are still exploratory: individuals and small groups are being consulted and "Waterfront Thinking" is infiltrating further and deeper into the community. Opinions, including those of the present reader, are being sought and a pattern is emerging.

Perhaps the small beginning of the first OISE-CPAC Waterfront Workshop is a first milestone on a long road to fuller living and learning in this urban community.

APPENDIX A

THE WATERFRONT IS FOR LIVING AND LEARNING

Monday, February 24, 1969

PROGRAM

9:00 a.m.	Assembly - Room 411, fourth floor
	Welcome - Kenneth F. Prueter, OISE
	"The Purpose of the Workshop" James A. Draper, OISE
9:45 a.m.	A Presentation of the Waterfront Plan Courtesy of the Metropolitan Toronto Planning Board
10:45 a.m.	"The Waterfront and Metro's Future" W. Grant Messer, Chairman, MTPB
	"Today's Children and Tomorrow's Waterfront" Barry G. Lowes, Chairman, Metropolitan Toronto School Board
	"Citizens and Their Waterfront" Donald Middleton, Chairman Ontario Division, CPAC
	"The Waterfront: An Adventure in Learning" D. McCormack Smyth, Dean Atkinson College, York University
11:15 a.m.	"The Way to the Workshops" Joyce M. Tyrrell, OISE and CPAC
11:30 a.m.	WORKSHOP GROUPS
2:15 p.m.	Plenary Session - Room 411, fourth floor Opportunity for informal discussion
3:00 p.m.	"Outcomes"
4:00 p.m.	Adjournment

SUGGESTED TOPICS FOR GROUP DISCUSSION

How do we meet the practical exigencies of building a vast scheme such as that of the Metro Waterfront and still provide opportunity for citizen appraisal and participation?

Can educationists be effective in bridging this gap, and if so, what is the role of the educational institution and what is done best through other avenues of learning?

These are the questions that underlie all the discussion topics that follow.

A. The Joyous Use of the Waterfront

What "joyous uses" can the public anticipate? How can educationists assist citizens to secure them?

B. Problems inherent in the major building developments now proposed for the central waterfront area

How can citizens be made aware of the enormous economic, physical, and social consequences of these schemes? How and when should citizens express their views? What is the role of the educationist?

C. The creation of new land on the Waterfront presents new opportunities and new responsibilities

What are the priorities in the use of land? Are there particular uses which educationalists should study? What have educationalists to say?

D. Jurisdictions on the Waterfront

Can these local negotiations be made meaningful to citizens as examples of the constitutional problems that Canada is attempting to solve?

E. The quality of our environment

How can the Metro Waterfront and its Plan be used to make vivid, questions of ecology, conservation, and pollution?

APPENDIX B

PARTICIPANTS

Adams, Mr. Graham
Head of Extension and Field Services
Community Planning Branch
Department of Municipal Affairs
Government of Ontario

Anderson, Mr. E.F.
Planning Analyst, Lands and Surveys Branch
Department of Lands and Forests
Government of Ontario

Bain, Mr. G. Keith
Department of Municipal Affairs
Government of Ontario

Blair, Mr. C.L.
Sheridan College of Applied Arts and Technology
Brampton, Ontario

Bower, Mr. R. John
Deputy Commissioner
Metro Planning Board
City Hall, Toronto

Burnett, Mr. Tom Reid
Department of Adult Education
OISE

Cole, Mr. David R.
Assistant Director, Citizenship Branch
Department of Citizenship and Immigration
Government of Ontario

Crann, Mr. Frank
Principal Planner
Metro Planning Board
City Hall, Toronto

Draper, Dr. James
Department of Adult Education
OISE

Dudley, Miss Rosemary
Waterfront Committee
Toronto Region Branch
CPAC
131 Bloor St. W.
Toronto 5, Ontario

Eilbeck, Mr. Jack
Youth & Recreation Branch
Department of Education
Government of Ontario

Eisen, Mrs. David M.
Past President
Association of Women Electors
95 Kimbark Blvd.
Toronto 12, Ontario

Falls, Professor Bruce
Department of Zoology
University of Toronto

Garry, Mr. Carl
Chairman, Social Sciences
Centennial College of Applied Arts and Technology
Scarborough, Ontario

Hancock, Mr. Macklin
Project Planning Associates
Toronto 5, Ontario

Jones, Mr. Jack
Chief Engineer
Toronto Harbour Commissioners
60 Harbour Street
Toronto 1, Ontario

Knechtel, Mrs. Myrna
Department of Adult Education
OISE

Longstaff, Mr. Frank
Secretary, Waterfront Advisory and Coordinating Committees
Metro Planning Board
City Hall, Toronto

Lord, Dr. Ross
Chairman
Metro Toronto and Region Conservation Authority
Vice Chairman, Metro Planning Board
City Hall, Toronto

Lowes, Mr. Barry G.
Chairman
Metro Toronto Board of Education
155 College Street
Toronto

Maarse, Mr. Leo
Planning Engineer
The Toronto Harbour Commissioners
60 Harbour Street
Toronto

Marshall, Mr. John
Toronto Telegram
Toronto

Munro, Mr. Ross
Globe and Mail
Toronto

Mattyasovszky, Dr. E.
Department of Urban and Regional Planning
University of Toronto

Messer, Mr. W. Grant
Chairman
Metro Toronto Planning Board
City Hall, Toronto

Middleton, Mr. Donald W.
Chairman, Ontario Division CPAC
Vice Chairman, Conservation Council of Ontario
Secretary, Ontario Federation of Agriculture

Milloy, Mr. A.L.
Superintendent
Toronto Secondary Schools
155 College Street
Toronto

Murray, Dr. Alex L.
Chairman, Toronto Region Branch, CPAC
Coordinator of Urban Studies, York University
111 Crescent Road, Toronto

McAndrew, Mr. Colin
Executive Producer of Television
Scarborough College
University of Toronto

McIntosh, Mr. Clifford
Department of Adult Education
OISE

Prueter, Dr. Kenneth F.
Coordinator of Development
OISE

Quazi, Mr. Saeed
Project Director
Department of Educational Planning
OISE

Rudick, Mr. V.W.
Conservation Authorities Branch
Department of Energy and Resources Management
Government of Ontario

Smyth, Dean D. McCormack
Joseph Atkinson College
York University
Downsview, Ontario

5

Spender, Mr. J.O.
Regional Development Branch
Department of Treasury and Economics
Government of Ontario

Stackhouse, Rev. Dr., R.F.
Chairman of the Board
Centennial College of Applied Arts and Technology
Scarborough

Stinson, Professor Jeffery
Department of Architecture
University of Toronto

Sykes, Mr. Malcolm
Principal
Dartnell Campus
George Brown College of Applied Arts and Technology
Toronto

Tonge, Mr. Ernest
Executive Director
Ontario Division, CPAC
32 Isabella Street
Toronto

Trimble, Mr. W.
Dean of Professional Development
Humber College of Applied Arts and Technology
Toronto

Tyrrell, Mrs. Joyce M.
Department of Adult Education
OISE

Walker, Mr. James E., M.P.
Parliamentary Secretary to Prime Minister of Canada
Executive Member, Toronto Region Branch CPAC

Watson, Miss Joyce N.
Chief Librarian
Municipal Reference Library
Metropolitan Toronto Library Board

Weatherall, Mr. Terry
Youth and Recreation Branch
Department of Education
Government of Ontario

Wilkinson, Mr. A.
Department of Social Sciences
Ryerson Polytechnical Institute
Toronto

Zwicker, Mr. Barry
Toronto Star
Toronto

APPENDIX C

INTRODUCTION TO WATERFRONT SLIDE SHOW/*John Bower, Deputy Commissioner Metro Planning Board*

This presentation of the Waterfront Plan will consist of a very brief introduction into the history of the Toronto waterfront leading to the preparation of the Waterfront Plan, followed by a slide presentation with a taped commentary of the Plan itself which will last about 25 minutes. After the slide show, I would like to say a few words regarding the implementation of the Plan and draw attention to specific areas which provide an opportunity for consideration of social, economic and administrative aspects which have broader significance than the Waterfront Plan itself.

From the beginning of Toronto's existence, the lakeshore has had an impact on the form and the character of the City. One can distinguish to date three phases of the waterfront development: the first, from Brule's time of "Toronto—the Meeting Place" to the advent of the railways in the 1850's; the second, from the 1850's to 1912 which is the date of approval of the Toronto Harbour Commissioners' Waterfront Plan; and the third, from that date to the present.

In each of these phases a different City existed on the Toronto waterfront. In the first one, the lake and the City were one—the City was on the lake and the harbour was part of the City's fabric and life. The lake as a recreational facility was easily accessible and widely used both in summer and winter.

The advent of the railroads to the Toronto area changed the character of the City and its waterfront—the industrialization of the lands surrounding the harbour began and the City slowly turned its back on the industrialized and busy waterfront. The only link to the lake were the islands and the bay itself which were used intensively as a major source of recreational facilities for the City's inhabitants.

Although the development of Toronto's waterfront was continuous from almost the beginning of the City itself, the Harbour Commissioners' Plan of 1912 was the first and, until now, the only comprehensive plan for the lakefront that Toronto has ever had. It has been implemented to the extent that the waterfront within the City boundaries has become an unique feature in the economic and recreational life of the City and, indeed, lately, with the comprehensive redevelopment of the Toronto Islands by the Metropolitan Corporation, a major factor in the recreational development of the whole Metropolitan area.

However, beyond the City's boundaries, the lack of a comprehensive plan and an implementing agency has been evident in the lack of public access to the lake, lack of beach and lakefront park facilities and the almost complete indifference to the potential of the lakefront setting by developments which were constructed backing up to the lake and fronting to commercial streets, parallel to the lake.

Lately, even within the City's limits, the continuation of the growth of the harbour, further development of the lakefront as a transportation corridor, the unresolved problem of transportation to the islands and the airport, and the pressures of development throughout the whole length of the Metropolitan waterfront brought us to the late 1950's, when the need for comprehensive waterfront planning and the first concept plan was established by the Metropolitan Planning Board in its 1959 Draft Official Plan. (This concept plan, by the way, withstood the severe scrutiny of the present study—and became the "point of departure" for the plan before you).

Simultaneously, the Toronto Region Branch of the Community Planning Association of Canada, which, since the beginning of the last decade, was struggling to inspire some official agency with the will and desire to prepare a comprehensive plan for the waterfront, undertook a series of public meetings dealing with the need to plan the Metropolitan lakefront. This action, like most of Toronto's "save something" actions, was very successful in supporting the Metropolitan Planning Board's efforts in establishing machinery for planning of the waterfront.

In 1961 the Planning Board published "Towards a Waterfront Plan" which was the first detailed examination of the problems associated with the needs and potential of the Metropolitan Toronto waterfront. The recommendations of that study prompted the establishment by the Metropolitan Council of the Waterfront Advisory Committee, comprising representatives of public and private organizations interested in the waterfront, and the Waterfront Technical Committee, comprising senior technical and administrative staff members of agencies having responsibilities related to the Lake and its waterfront. These two committees were assigned the task of assisting the Board in preparing a plan for the development of the Metropolitan waterfront.

The composition of the committees ensured the free exchange of essential technical information, the identification of objectives to satisfy the many needs of a lakeside metropolis, and an assembly of views on how these objectives might be coordinated and achieved. The importance and value of this plan is that it reflects the views and ideas of a large number of contributors each being very conscious of the value of a lakeside location for various uses.

Slide Show

I would first like to illustrate the importance of the Plan at this point of time, notwithstanding the absence of an overall implementing agency as eventually envisaged. The Plan contains elements which were conceived by individual agencies many years before the Plan was prepared, proposals which were adopted by various agencies largely as a result of the plan preparation. The Plan has served already to provide a sound framework within which the proposals of various agencies can be rationally viewed and it serves to make the general public aware of the overall importance of the individual elements.

As an example, it is probably not generally known that the Metropolitan Corporation adopted a plan for a Scarborough Bluffs Park as far back as 1956, and has been acquiring property to this end since that time. In the same way, the action of the Harbour Commissioners in the construction of the new breakwater and outer harbour which provides the key to the central area redevelopment received little publicity until viewed within the context of the Waterfront Plan.

It must be stressed that since many of the proposals which are incorporated in the overall Waterfront Plan have been already adopted by individual agencies responsible for those areas, implementation of the Plan is well advanced.

(1) Scarborough Bluffs Park (267 acres owned by Metro);
(2) Orsini Property Acquisition, Mississauga (20 acres purchased in 1968);
(3) Harbour breakwater started in 1963;
(4) East Point Park made available by Scarborough-site of Filtration Plant;
(5) Mimico Creek fill, stockpile by Metro;
(6) Palace Pier apartment proposal with public easements;
(7) C.N.E. Provincial building;
(8) Campeau Proposal—Harbour City—value of plan in prescribing public policy for future land use;
(9) Frenchman's Bay, land acquisition, 2 1/2 miles lake frontage.

I would now like to illustrate some of the economic, jurisdictional, and design considerations which affected the conceptual plan as finally presented to Metro Council.

The Central sector best illustrates the complexity of issues affecting the final design.

(1) Harbour Commission jurisdiction with prime concern being the movement of goods through the Toronto Harbour.
(2) Access to Harbour—previously western gap.
(3) Access to airport and future of airport.
(4) Access to islands while desiring to keep out autos.
(5) Conflict of airport with island recreational use.
(6) Conflict of uses for Harbour redevelopment—economic consideration with respect to airport lands.
(7) Availability of fill—dredging material—depths of water for filling.
(8) Recreation—swimming areas—sailing areas—access to lake—provisions for public and semi-private recreation facilities—safe harbours.

Problems of Government Jurisdiction

While this aspect of the Waterfront Plan is very complex since it involves federal, provincial, and local governments to different degrees, there is one small story that illustrates how critical government jurisdiction can be.

This slide which shows the Metropolitan Plan has arrows pointing to the Rattray Marsh in Mississauga and the Petticoat area in Pickering. Both areas are approximately equal distance from downtown Toronto. Both areas were proposed for public acquisition as recreation areas during the preparation of the Plan. The Petticoat Creek area with approximately 300 acres as shown on this slide, was acquired by the Metropolitan Toronto and Region

Conservation Authority with the Metropolitan Corporation paying 50 percent as the municipal contribution and the Province paying the balance. By contrast, the Rattray Marsh which was an equally attractive area, particularly suitable as a nature reserve, was not acquired since it lay within the Credit Conservation Area, which had no municipal funds for its acquisition since the financial basis of Metropolitan Toronto was not available to that authority. The result as will be seen on this slide is that the area is being substantially subdivided with only the marshy area and certain beach frontage being retained for public use. The problem of jurisdiction illustrated in these two cases points to the importance of the current examination of regional government areas arising from recent provincial statements.

Conflict of Public and Private Interests

The Plan was devised with a keen awareness of the possible conflict between public and private interests. As a result, access to major park areas is obtained over major arterial streets avoiding single family residential areas. Fill, in the form of islands takes place generally in front of single family areas which are not going to redevelop and where fill is to take place immediately in front of existing shorelines, residential redevelopment to high rise apartments is proposed. Notwithstanding this basic objective certain areas exist where single family development may be adversely affected.

(1) New Toronto;
(2) Scarborough Bluffs;
(3) Frenchman's Bay.

Opportunities for Study in Depth

- governmental jurisdiction;
- recreation needs;
- environmental problems;
- transportation in urban growth generally—from center to fringe.

APPENDIX D

WHAT IS THE COMMUNITY PLANNING ASSOCIATION OF CANADA?

CPAC is a nation-wide organization. Its aim is to bring about an improvement in the quality of the environment in which Canadians live by promoting sound community, urban, and regional planning.

The following is the record of the efforts of a citizen organization, the Toronto Region Branch of CPAC, to achieve excellence in the quality of the environment on the Metropolitan Toronto Waterfront. It is important to note (i) that the strength of its action has lain in cooperation with many other official and unofficial groups, and (ii) that sustained effort has been required: fifteen years to date, and probably fifteen to come. The first step was an overall plan, giving the concept of what the waterfront might become; the next step is toward implementation of the best features of that plan.

1954 "Planning for the Lakefront and River Valleys." This was a booklet issued by five citizen organizations in Toronto calling for more consideration of Open Space for Recreation. The resolutions in this booklet assisted in gaining the cooperation of the local Conservation Authorities with the newly formed Metro Parks Department in order to secure the present large recreation areas in the river valleys. It also led to CPAC's close identification with public recreation on the waterfront and thus to the need for waterfront planning.

1957 "A Water Park—Toronto Islands Regained." CPAC, in cooperation with two other citizen groups, commissioned a book of "conceptual" sketches to illustrate imaginative park uses for the Islands.

1959 CPAC public meeting "Toronto's Waterfront: Yours to Make or Mar." This led to a brief calling for Metro Council to authorize an overall plan. The target objectives that this CPAC brief contained were incorporated in 1963 into the "Appraisal of the Waterfront Plan" prepared by Metro officials at the behest of Council. The Appraisal became the official basis for the preparation of the Waterfront Conceptual Plan of 1968.

1961-69 During these years, CPAC worked to inform Metro citizens concerning progress of the Plan and to impress on elected representatives the importance and urgency of the undertaking.

CPAC activities included seven public meetings, eight briefs to government or planning boards, three delegations before Council, publication of two special reports to members (1964 and 1968) and a "Waterfront Conspectus."

1962	"Waterfront Conspectus" The "Conspectus" was a course spread over four months. There was a paid enrollment of 125 including elected municipal representatives, planning board members, civic organizations and waterfront industries, as well as citizens at large. The Conspectus went far to convince the Municipal Councils that there was a definite desire on the part of citizens for a well planned and developed Waterfront for Metro Toronto.
1964 to the present	CPAC has had representation on the Waterfront Advisory Committee of the Metro Planning Board. There it has pressed not only for the Conceptual Plan but for early consideration of the means of its implementation.
1969	The OISE-CPAC Waterfront Workshop has added another dimension to what has already been accomplished. The development of the Waterfront is seen not only as the implementation of a plan, but as an opportunity to inform and involve citizens in many ways in the future of their community.

APPENDIX E

DISCUSSION HIGHLIGHTS

1. Promotion

a) There was felt to be need for rediscovery of the waterfront by the public. Enthusiasm for its use is the key to public pressure for continuing sound development.

b) The role of the communications media, including use of both amateur and professional films is of utmost importance, but it was stressed that definite objectives for promotion and for staging of the Plan are needed in order that the media may make a significant contribution.

c) Promotion intended to attract the best type of private developer was urged, and the very fact of the Plan was cited as good public relations. It was suggested that if the basic public rights, particularly as to water access could be more clearly established, then clearer guidelines could be given to developers and subsequent misunderstanding and delay could be avoided. Also, the government's position would be more dignified, since the government would not then need to be always on the defensive in negotiation with developers.

d) The "what's in it for me?" approach to the waterfront was urged as a constructive way to appeal to politicians, educationists, developers, many special groups, and the public at large. There is something for almost everyone in the waterfront and this motivation if it is in conformity with good principles of planning, should be used fully.

2. The Need for Choice and its Potential for Public Education

Several groups were concerned with the present lack of opportunities for public choice.

a) It was felt that when presented with one vast plan, the public was helpless to do anything but "nit pick," whereas if two or more feasible planning schemes were shown, together with the advantages and disadvantages, the public (and the news media) would become involved and would be capable of giving their elected representatives intelligent advice.

b) One group took exception to a statement by a member of the Planning Staff, namely, that the Metro waterfront dictated its own uses and allowed for very little choice. This group thought that although the location of major land uses, e.g., beaches, harbours, industrial areas, might now be inevitable, there was still great room for choice in the treatment of the land uses, e.g., what kind of open space? what kind of housing? what kind of institutional uses? and so on.

c) Even where decisions had to be made by government on the advice of experts without reference to the public, it seemed that public trust in the government would be greater and understanding of the problems more intelligent, if the thinking leading to the decisions were given more clearly.

3. The Potential of the Waterfront for Education

"Education" was discussed by various groups in various contexts: (i) Knowledge, e.g., of tadpoles or of ships from far countries, or of how to sail a boat. (ii) Educational institutions: opportunities of design for the schools of the new communities; the appropriateness of locating certain educational and research institutions on the waters of the Great Lakes and within a large urban area. (iii) The use of the waterfront and its planning as a means of interesting the citizens in the development of one part of their city, and thus in the whole. (iv) A basis for research. Research was seen as the best contribution the universities can make toward citizen involvement.

4. The "Information" Functions of a Waterfront Agency

There was relatively little discussion of waterfront jurisdiction or the type of agency or organization needed to implement the present planning concept, as this was not within the terms of reference of the workshop. Three points, however, came out strongly.

a) The opportunity for an "initiating" body (not necessarily a commission or authority), that could be the focus of public involvement in the waterfront, acting as two-way liaison between the public and the government-in-charge. If some of the funds realized through waterfront development or elsewhere could be vested in such a body, it could then "prime the pump" for the many volunteer citizen activities that would support and promote the waterfront development once the machinery were set in motion.

b) Such a body might interpret decisions to the public, as mentioned above, as well as channel the thoughts of members of the public to elected representatives.

c) Through such a body, it might be possible for serious research students in the universities to gain access to the records giving the thinking on which waterfront development decisions were based. This might be a breakthrough in the dilemma of many Canadian scholars who complain that so very little Canadian source material is available for research. The fact that the waterfront holds out so many research opportunities in such fields as environmental studies, sociology, government, urban planning, as well as the many aspects of water, raised suggestions of research teams or task forces working through an "initiating body."

5. **The Far-Reaching Aspects of the Waterfront: "We have hold of something bigger than we know."**

a) One group dwelt upon the unity of the waterfront with the rivers that feed it and the link with the hinterland: they saw it as part of a large regional pattern; and they felt that all the people of the region had a stake in the waterfront.

b) Another group discussed its links with the whole of Metro, particularly with the central core; they saw it as an integral part of the urban scene.

c) Yet another group stressed its relationship to water and thence to international ties and opportunities.

d) Several groups saw the waterfront as a place where many of the problems of Canadian federal-provincial relationships could be studied in miniature. Pollution control was frequently mentioned.

One group leader summed it up: the Waterfront Plan becomes an instrument for involvement, for a mass study on urban involvement.